

1. Regarding the requirement to include teaming agreements in the proposal . . . L.4(a)(1): Please confirm that this is a required only for entities that make up the Offeror, including “teaming” subcontractors, if applicable.

Answer:

The requirement is “Copies of teaming and/or subcontract agreements (including fee arrangement), if any, for those organizations that will be part of the Offer, shall be included as an attachment to the approach.” Thus, it includes entities that make up the Offer not just the Offeror.

2. The FY 2001 Planning Guidance referenced in Section L (page L-35) of the RFP that is currently available on the Contract Recompensation Web Site primarily contains information related to the Yucca Mountain Project. Please identify if similar information related to the other elements of the OCRWM Program can be made available, e.g., the Waste Acceptance, Storage and Transportation Project, and the Program Business Management Center.

Answer:

The FY2001 Planning Guidance for Waste Acceptance, Storage and Transportation Project, and the Program Business Management Center may be found on our web site under Additional References and Clarifications.

3. Should we assume that details regarding TRW employee benefits would not be made available until contract award?

Answer:

Further details regarding TRW employee benefits will not be made available until contract award. This information is not considered necessary to submit a proposal.

4. Page L-18, Section L.4(e)(2) , states, “Using the Past Performance Package identified in Section L, Attachment E, the Offeror shall submit the relevant information for no more that five public or private contracts, which are currently being performed or have been completed within the past three years. These must be related to operations similar to the State of Work contained in Section C of the RFP with emphasis on managing nuclear facility operations.” The current scope of work described in Section C2.9.0 doesn’t involve nuclear facility operations. Does the word “operations” mean that the Contractor must describe the projects for which they were directly responsible for the management of the day-to-day operations of a nuclear facility as an owner or M&O Contractor?

Answer:

Section C2.9.0 addresses all repository operations, both nuclear operations and non-nuclear operations. The past performance information request in Section L.4(e)(2), placed emphasis on "managing" nuclear facility operations. As used here, "manage" encompasses activities from precicensing through operations, including design, research, development, testing, licensing, construction and operation activities.

5. Page L-21, Section L.6-Interviews, paragraph (f), please describe the interview process. Will the interviews consist of controlled questions and will each of the attendees (Key Personnel) be asked the same questions?

Answer:

Regarding the interview process, the interviews will consist of controlled questions. However, each of the attendees (Key Personnel) will not be asked the same questions. Each offeror will be asked the same set of questions.

6. The final RFP for the new M&O contract has language which both concerns and confuses me. In the draft RFP, the USGS was listed under "Interactions with the Program," and was generally not "lumped" with the National Labs as pertained to the M&O in its management role. The final RFP has left the USGS as "Interactions with the Program," but has changed the role of the Labs relative to subcontracting to the M&O and then "lumped" the USGS with the Labs. The Labs are still listed as "Program Participants" while the USGS is not. In addition, the wording in the RFP states that the M&O will ". . . plan, integrate, and manage the work activities of the National Laboratories and the USGS." If I take the word "manage" to mean "direct" -- which I believe is a reasonable assumption -- then the issue of a contractor directing a Federal agency arises. The current three-party MOU between the DOE, the current M&O, and the USGS, uses the wording, "provide programmatic guidance."

I wonder if you could provide clarification of the DOE's expectations for the USGS, especially as it pertains to being "managed" by a DOE M&O contractor.

Answer:

You are correct that M&O contractors cannot 'manage' a government entity as you have defined it. They can, however, provide programmatic guidance. It would be our intent to continue to operate with a three-party agreement between DOE, the Management Contractor, and the USGS that clarifies the roles of the respective organizations. The USGS should have been included as a Program Participant in Section C, and this will be reflected when the RFP is amended.